

REMARKS

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to certain claim amendments made in a prior response on the basis that certain of the amendments introduced new matter. Accordingly, the claims have been amended to overcome this objection.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner responds to applicant's arguments regarding patentability of the claims over Davies and Ben-Ze'ev.

Applicant essentially makes two arguments. First, neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev discloses or suggests plural televisions that transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have performed a function commanded by a host processor. Second, neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev discloses or suggests a host processor that determines which televisions do not transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have performed a function. Accordingly, applicants concludes that a combination of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev by one of ordinary skill in the art would not have produced the invention of independent claims 31 and 42.

The Examiner responds by arguing that, because Ben-Ze'ev shows the remote control of two televisions, and because Davies shows receiving feedback that is

relevant to the execution of a control by a television and providing that feedback to a user, the invention of independent claims 31 and 42 would have somehow been obvious.

However, there are a number of problems with the Examiner's response.

For example, Davies does not deal with a multiple television environment at all, and Ben Ze'ev does not get feedback from any televisions indicating performance of a function. Therefore, the combination of Davies and Ben Ze'ev does not teach getting feedback from multiple televisions indicating that they have performed a function commanded by the remote control. Accordingly, these references would not teach the inventions of independent claims 31 and 42 to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As another example, independent claims 31 and 42 require a determination of which televisions do not send back a confirmation indicating that a function has been performed. Neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev discloses or suggests this feature.

Davies deals with a single television so that the remote control need not make a determination as to which of multiple televisions failed to send a

confirmation signal. Ben-Ze'ev discloses plural televisions but does not require a confirmation signal when a television performs a function. Therefore, neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev can suggest determining which of plural televisions fails to send back a confirmation signal indicating performance of a function.

As a further example, the Examiner has cited no motivation to combine Davies and Ben-Ze'ev in such a way as to provide an arrangement in which a remote control determines which televisions fail to confirm execution of a command. The Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to inform the user who had control of all televisions that a requested operation was indeed performed. However, this motivation is derived from the present application and not from the prior art. Moreover, it does not follow that the remote control must determine which television failed to provide confirmation. Indeed, because the televisions are controlled one at a time as disclosed in Ben-Ze'ev, there is no need for the remote control to determine which television fails to confirm because it will be evident to the user that the television just controlled was the television failing to confirm.

Therefore, for all of the reasons given above,
the teachings of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev do not suggest the
inventions of independent claims 31 and 42 to one of
ordinary skill in the art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is clear that the claims of the present application patentably distinguish over the art applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and issuance of the above captioned patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 258-5774
CUSTOMER NO. 28574

By: 

Trevor B. Joike
Reg. No: 25,542

August 11, 2006